BACONIANA

VOL. XXV. No. 101. OCTOBER, 1941.

EDITORIAL.

FOR the first time in its history "BACONIANA" was advertised for sale in July with highly satisfactory results in increased circulation, membership of the Bacon Society and enquiries for its literature,

We again break new ground in this issue and hope that the prize competition which we announce will create fresh interest in the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy and attract those whose belief in the Divine William remains undisturbed and who are able to give reasons for the faith that is in them.

The account given by Mr. Alan Keen of his acquisition of a portrait inscribed as one of Francis Bacon in 1619 is interesting whatever view may be taken of its authenticity, and we reproduce it accordingly together with a copy upon which hat and hair have been painted in. Even with this striking alteration before us we are not persuaded (and neither indeed is Mr. Keen) that the portrait is one of Francis Bacon. What was he like? His chief facial characteristics, very noticeable in the portraits by Janssen and Simon de Pass, were an unusually high brow; an aquiline nose with bridge rather broad at the base and delicately shaped, deep set eyes with remarkable long eye-lids; a small firm mouth with the curved line referred to as Cupid's bow and a firm pointed chin. His hair grew backward on the forehead; in childhood he wore it close clipped but in youth and early manhood he allowed it to grow longer, combing it back so that it fell curling on his ruff. He grew a moustache turning downwards to his beard which, like his hair, inclined to curl. No

doubt Time and Labour and Care ploughed the strongly marked facial lines which were developed in later years. The late Mrs. C. M. Pott thought the Real Shakespeare was very thin and that Clarence's description of Henry IV applied to the poet himself:—

> "The incessant care and labour of his mind
> Hath wrought the mure that should confine it in
> So thin, that life looks through, and will break out"
> 2 Hy. IV. IV.4.

The photographs we reproduce of Gray's Inn Square and the statue of Bacon before their destruction were taken by Mr. Harold E. Hare, an Associate of the Bacon Society for many years: we are indebted to him not only for his consent to their publication but for making enlargements of what were originally snapshots only. The copyright in the photographs of the ruined Hall is that of *The Times* and it is reproduced with permission which we are glad to acknowledge.

Among "the memorials and things of fame that do renown the city" are (or were) the Temple, Gray's Inn and Serjeant's Inn, London's nurseries of the Law. Half of the Temple has been destroyed; of Gray's Inn Hall and the adjoining Chapel nothing except the outer walls remain; the statue of Bacon was destroyed and the library and most of its 20,000 volumes were burned out, but the catalpa tree planted by Sir Walter Raleigh was not damaged.

It is strange, to quote the *Times Literary Supplement*, in how different a degree those who love London care about the loss of its ancient lovely places. It is not in the least that for some it is only a part of the great general sorrow; it is something distinct. The War may have destroyed less of London's past than had modern reconstruction of previous years but it is swifter. There will perhaps be another Hall of Gray's Inn, but the Spirit of Eld which sanctified that which is now a ruin can never be brought back. And much is there for tears.

RUINS OF THE HALL OF GRAY'S INN.

ERECTED XVI*th* CENTURY.

DESTROYED 10TH MAY 1941.

THE SQUARE, GRAY'S INN.

MANY 18TH CENTURY CHAMBERS DESTROYED.

Among its papers rescued from Canonbury Tower was found what must be one of the earliest statements by the Bacon Society of its objects and scheme. It is a very interesting document and is calculated so many years since its publication to raise speculation as to the position in which the Society might have found itself to-day could the work undertaken by its predecessors have been completed. It must generally be admitted that to comparatively few is Francis Bacon, even at the present time, more than a name—a name associated only with a vague reputation of having been connected with a new system of philosophy and of one whose public life and character has been justly condemned by Pope and Lord Macaulay. To expose their mis-statements and injustice as well as those of later writers: to restore to Bacon the reputation he enjoyed among his contemporaries so far as an unprejudiced consideration of the records of his private and public careers and of the history of his time will allow: to encourage acquaintance with his work: to establish the world debt to him as the student of "all knowledge"—these were stated to be the primary aims of the Society and its Council. And such of course they remain. In inviting membership (so long ago as 1903) the Council necessarily referred to "the further object which the Society had in view." The authorship of the plays of 'Shakespeare' had assumed a prominence in public discussions which is not to be ignored." The Council desired to promote the continued investigation of this subject and while acknowledging that members individually believed that it is to Bacon and not to Shakspere that the world is indebted for the plays and poems attributed to the latter they believed that further investigation was desirable. And here and now again the Society can appeal for increased support not only with the object of solving the authorship problem but for the better understanding of 'Shakespeare' himself as the Man and Artist revealed in his Work. It does matter who Shakespeare was: it does matter who wrote the plays and little, if any, further light can be thrown upon the many problems the latter present while critics persist

in assuming as axiomatic and as the very basis of all their research, argument and conclusions, the truth of a delusion which appears to be opposed alike to reason and to commonsense.

The Bacon Society appeals for the consideration of the authorship problem in the interests of our understanding of the Shakespearean plays and poems themselves. Shackled to the Stratford tradition it is impossible to find certain ground from which to approach such problems as those of the text, of chronology, or even authenticity. Who was Shakespeare? What did he write? There are still some of us to whom Truth is an end in itself; to whom it is quite sufficient to dispel doubts, to dissipate false teaching and to exorcise some of the delusions by which the human mind is possessed even though human pleasure is not thereby appreciably increased.

But it is the method by which the Council thought its objects might be best attained which challenges us today. This was to obtain records (a) of all the editions of Bacon's acknowledged works and of all information available with reference to them, (b) of all manuscripts and letters relating to the Bacon family or affairs with which Francis and Anthony were connected, (c) of all contemporary literature in which reference is made to Bacon (d) of all the early editions of the work of contemporary writers with whom it has been suggested he was in one way or another associated and (e) which we think the most important of all, the compilation of a Bacon Concordance and the preparation of accurate statistics as to the extent and points of coincidence in the vocabularies of Bacon, Shakespeare and other writers.

The Council concluded (as it well might) with the statement that the foregoing would no doubt be the work of years but it expressed the hope that if the framework were laid out and members of the Society were informed the Council might obtain help from outside sources. Sooner or later we suppose—unless it be that civilisation as we know it must perish and Europe

return to the Dark Ages—the war must end and sanity return to a distracted world. Men and women may once more find time and opportunity to walk the ways of pleasantness and the paths of Peace. The Bacon Society has done much; it has still more to do. The name and memory which he left to men's charitable speeches and the next ages has in great measure been restored to Francis Bacon. Only recently it was written that his fall was one of the greatest spiritual tragedies in the history of mankind. To blame such a being is childish: all censure is an impertinence.

For the rest it seems progress has been made: the faith or credulity of many in the authorship of the Stratford Shakspere has been shaken: much that was accepted without question as gospel truth is now doubted even among the orthodox—the Mandarin-Professors, critics Higher and otherwise, and the general reader and lover of the Shaksperian plays and poems alike. The tendency seems to be to substitute for Shakspere of Stratford a syndicate; even in the Sacred Canon, the Great Folio itself, the work of many hands is now detected; for the editors of the New Cambridge Shakespeare—his name is indeed a noun of multitude. But if the First Folio does enshrine in its wonderful pages the work of many pens, when Jonson wrote of "my Beloved the Authour" he knew there was only one Shakespeare, the Great Master Mind. It is to this supreme position that the name and memory of Francis Bacon must be restored not only by foreign nations nor in the next ages but now while the Bacon Society has "cause and will and strength and means" to assist in the task.

BACON AND MEASURE FOR MEASURE.

By W. S. Melsome.

IN the last issue of Baconiana the following statement was made: "Angelo stands *pro verbis legis* (for the letter of the law) as laid down by Bacon in his legal aphorisms (*De Aug. VIII*, III)." We will now draw upon these aphorisms to make good that statement.

Within the space of seven lines in this third chapter of the eighth book we have the Latin equivalents of the words "dead," "awake" and "sleep" applied to laws.

From aphorism 57:—

"Living laws killed in the embraces of the dead ones."

From aphorism 58:—

"Although, as is well said, nobody should be wiser than the laws (Aristotle, Rhet. I, 15, 12) *yet this should be understood of laws when they are awake and not when they sleep."*

And within the space of four lines in *Measure for Measure* we have "dead," "awake" and "it hath slept":—

(A.) "The law hath not been dead though it hath slept
. . . now 'tis awake."
(*II*, 2, 90).

To find "it hath slept" in Bacon's work we must turn to *Life V*, p. 124:—

"I see a fair deed . . . . and I see some probable reason why it hath slept."

And to find "sleep" in *Measure for Measure* we must turn to *I*, 3, 19:—

"Strict statutes and most biting laws,
. . . . Which for this fourteen years we have let sleep."

From aphorism 46:—

"As that law is the best which leaves least to the discretion of the judge, so is that judge the best who leaves least to himself." (*De Aug. VIII*, III, and *Aristotle, Rhet. I*, 1.)

Angelo to Isabel:

(B.) "It is the law not I condemns your brother."

In this reply Angelo leaves nothing to his own breast. From aphorism 39:—

"Nor should a man lose his life without first knowing that he had forfeited it."

Angelo to Isabel:

(C.) "Your brother is a forfeit of the law."

Even the frivolous Lucio says: "He (Angelo) hath pick'd out an act under whose heavy sense your brother's life fall into forfeit." (*Ib., I*, 4, 64.)

It will be noticed that Angelo's three replies to Isabel (A, B and C) all contain the word "law," and yet Isabel never once pleaded law to save her brother; she even admits:

"My brother had but justice
In that he did the thing for which he died."
(*Meas., V*, 1, 453).

Why then did Angelo make these statements to Isabel? Surely to show her that his judgment was contained within the compass of the law; for says Bacon, *"The judge as long as his judgment was contained within the compass of the law was excused; the subject knew by what law he was to govern himself, and his actions; nothing was left to the judge's discretion* (*Life III*, pp. 331-2); *and where it was required long since by a bill in parliament to have somewhat left to the judge to allow or dislike in a particular case which should be made arbitrary by the said bill, it was rejected, and upon this reason, that men were better be subject to a known inconvenience than to an unknown discretion* (*Ib.*); and Shakespeare's reason for objecting to confer upon judges too much discretion was, that we should never be rid of those

> "perilous mouths,
> That bear in them one and the self-same tongue,
> Either of condemnation or approof;
> Bidding the law make court'sy to their will"
> (*Meas., II*, 4, 172);

for a judge who will bid the law make courtesy to his will, will also "*bend the laws to policy*" (*Works VII*, p. 678). There is not much difference between bending and courtesying, and in each case it makes the judge "*a legislator and to have all things dependent upon his will*" (*De Aug. VIII*, III, aphorism 44).

We have seen in the April issue of BACONIANA (p. 170) that the duke thought as Bacon did that certain ensnaring penal laws (such as that which condemned Claudio to death) were, beyond all reason, severe. Why then did he not repeal this law while he was the supreme equity judge: the man of "absolute power and place here in Vienna"? And why, when he delivered over to Angelo this absolute power and place, did he say to him,

> "Your scope is as mine own
> So to enforce or qualify the laws
> As to your soul seems good";

thereby giving him unlimited discretion, and thus making it impossible to preserve "*that primary dignity of the law, certainty*"? (Aphorism 8); for "*certainty is so essential to a law, that a law without it cannot be just.*" (*Ib.*)

The answer is that the legal part of *Measure for Measure* could not have been written, and the author of the play could not have demonstrated to the world what was as dear to his heart as it was to Bacon's; namely, the gross injustice which in bad times he thought likely to ensue from neglecting the repeal of such ensnaring penal laws—injustice which actually did ensue, as Bacon tells us, in the bad times of Henry VII, and which is also made to recur in Vienna during the reign of Angelo, the corrupt deputy.

While Isabel preached all gospel and no law to Angelo, he preached all law and no gospel to her in reply; and, as laws are stronger than precepts, Isabel is easily defeated,

and is forced to change her tactics and to ask for pity. This follows a question by Isabel, and Angelo's remarkable ten-line reply, which I now record in full because it contains no less than eight reminders of Bacon.

Isabel:

"Good my lord, bethink you;
Who is it that hath died for this offence?
There's many have committed it."

Angelo:

"The law hath not been dead, though it hath slept:
Those many had not dared to do that evil,
If the first that did the edict infringe
Had answered for his deed: now 'tis awake,
Takes note of what is done; and, like a prophet
Looks in a glass, that shows what future evils,
Either new, or by remissness new-conceived,
And so in progress to be hatch'd and born,
Are now to have no successive degrees,
But, ere they live, to end."

(*Meas.*, *II*, 2, 90).

We have already called upon two of Bacon's legal aphorisms and a letter to King James to find "dead," "awake" and "it hath slept" applied to laws. Now turn to aphorism 41:—

A. "*It is the part of discipline to punish the first buddings of all grave offences.*"

B. "Those many had not dar'd to do that evil,
If the first that did the edict infringe
Had answered for his deed."

'B' is a reason for 'A' and so reminds us of Bacon. Bacon continued:—

"*And it is the part of clemency to punish the middle or intermediate acts to prevent their ends from being accomplished.*"

Angelo:

"Now 'tis awake . . . and . . . shows what future evils . . . are now to have no successive degrees, but, ere they live, to end."

If these evils are to have no successive degrees their ends cannot be accomplished.

From aphorism 10:—

> "*The narrowness of human wisdom cannot foresee all the cases that time may produce. Whence new cases, and cases omitted* ("Either new, or by remissness new-conceived"—Angelo's speech) *often present themselves.*"

The income-tax law in recent times provides an excellent example of the remissness or neglect of the law to prescribe present remedies against future evasions, and this neglect or omission is the cause why new and evil conceptions arise in the minds of people by which they hope to "run by the hideous law, like mice by lions." (*Meas.*, *I*, 4, 64).

And what are successive degrees? First, the conception,—

"The strong and swelling evil of my conception" (II, 4, 7); next, the progress of its being "hatch'd and born" II, 2, 97), and finally the putting in act of the bad intention.

We cannot punish a conception because we are not aware of it. We must, therefore, await the progress of its being 'hatch'd and born' before we can, as it were, strangle it at birth, and prevent the end from being accomplished; in other words, to prevent it from "having successive degrees." Angelo's evil conception could not be dealt with until he communicated his intention to Isabel; then, and then only, could care be taken that

> —his act did not o'ertake his bad intent."
>
> (*Meas.*, *V*, 1, 456);

and, as regards Isabel, it was so.

Not only does Shakespeare agree with Bacon regarding the punishment of the first overtures and intermediate parts of grave offences, but he tells us that those who think otherwise are fools:—

> "Fools do those villains pity who are punished
> Ere they have done their mischief."
>
> (*Lear*, *IV*, 2, 54).

In strict law we do not punish before the actual offence is committed; but, in such a case as the Gunpowder plot, who would await the final act?

"The Star-Chamber discerneth also principally of four kinds of causes: forces, frauds, crimes various of stellionate, and the inchoations or middle acts towards crimes capital or heinous, not actually committed or perpetrated."
(*Works VI*, p. 85; *Hist. Hen. VII*).

The same is expressed in Angelo's speech.

Bacon continued:—

"But that which was principally aimed at by this act was force, and the two chief supports of force, cimbination of multitudes, and maintenance of headship of great persons."

And this seems to be what Shakespeare had in mind when he wrote:

"France spreads his banners in our noiseless land,
With plumed helm they slayer begins threats,
Whilst thou, a moral fool, sitt'st still";
(*Lear IV*, 2, 56—Q2);

whereas *"the true way is, to stop the seeds of sedition and rebellion in their beginnings"* (*Works VI*, p. 80); for *"nipping them in the bud is fuller of clemency"* *Life IV*, p. 408); and, as was stated above, *"It is the part of clemency to punish the middle acts and prevent their ends from being accomplished."*

We now come to the seventh reminder of Bacon:—

"New-conceived,
And so in progress to be hatch'd and born."

"Born" applies to animals and "hatch'd" to birds; and between the conception and the hatching of the egg some time must elapse; and this is what interested Bacon, who says, *"For birds there is double inquiry: the distance between the treading or coupling and the laying of the egg; and again between the egg laid, and the disclosing or hatching"* (*Sylva Sylvarum* 759).

While Hamlet's "melancholy sat on brood" his uncle said,

"There's something in his soul,
O'er which his melancholy sits on brood;
And I do doubt the hatch and the disclose
Will be some danger."
(*Ham., III*, 1, 172).

Again, *"It is reported by the ancients, that the ostrich layeth her eggs under sand, where the heat of the sun discloseth them"* (*Sylva Sylvarum*, 856).

"Anon, as patient as the female dove,
When that her golden couplets are disclosed,
His silence will sit drooping."

(*Ham.*, *V*, 1, 309).

When two or more words or phrases occur close together in the writings of Bacon and Shakespeare, they have more effect on the mind of a reader than when they occur apart; so when *'golden sleep'* and *'uprouse'* were found close together in Bacon's note book (*Promus*—1207 and 1215), and 'golden sleep' and 'uprous'd' within two lines of each other in 'Romeo,' the wonder was which borrowed from the other? And when *'twenty echoes'* and *'choir of echoes'* were found close together in Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum*, and within a few lines of each other in 'Venus and Adonis' men wondered again which borrowed from the other. Fifteen years after Bacon discovered his twenty echoes, 'Venus and Adonis' was published (1593), but Bacon did not record his discovery before 1626, in *Sylva Sylvarum*. So again when we find *'disclosing or hatching'* in *Sylva Sylvarum*, and the 'hatch and the disclose' in *Hamlet*; so with 'Time and truth'; so with *'modus,' 'triplex,' 'primo.' 'secundo,' 'tertio,'* in the *De Augmentis VIII*, (II), and 'primo,' 'secundo,' 'tertio,' 'triplex,' 'measure,' in *Twelfth Night* (*V*, 1).

But when identities of thought and expression are found close together in one man's writing and far apart in another's they do not affect us to the same extent, e.g.,

"It is one method to begin swimming with bladders, which keep you up, and another to begin dancing with heavy shoes, which weigh you down."

(*De Aug.*, *VI IV*).

"You have dancing shoes
With nimble soles: I have a soul of lead
So stakes me to the ground I cannot move."

(*Romeo*, *I*, 4, 14).

Some time elapsed between the production of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Henry VIII*, where we find:

"Like little wanton boys that swim on bladders."

(*IV*, 2, 359).

The eighth reminder of Bacon is the "prophet" who "looks in a glass that shows what future evils," etc. Bacon:

"If we could obtain a magic glass wherein we might view all the enmities and all the hostile designs that are at work against us."

(*De Aug.*, *VIII*, II, parabola IV).

We still have prophets with their magic glasses to tell us what evils are to come upon us to-morrow or the next day.

Let us now review Angelo's ten line speech. The first line informs Isabel that his judgment is *contained within the compass of the law*; he then pauses to answer her statement, and to say that those many had not dar'd to do that evil if the first that did the edict infringe had answered for his deed; that is, if Bacon's advice had been followed; namely, *to punish the first buddings of all grave offences*; then, returning to the law, he says, "now 'tis awake"; for I, "the voice of the recorded law" (II, 4, 61) shall take care in future *to punish the intermediate acts of such offences* (as Bacon directs) so that they shall have no successive degrees; and no matter how narrow human prudence may have been in the past, I shall extend that prudence to include remedies against future evasions; i.e., evils, either new, or (owing to remissness on the part of the law to provide remedies against them) newly conceived by the people in their efforts to "run by the law."

From aphorism 40:—

"And let there be, besides penalty, a note of infamy or punishment by way of admonishing others, and chastising delinquents, as it were, by putting them to the blush with shame and scandal."

Claudio:

"Fellow, why dost thou show me thus to the world?"

(*Meas.*, *I*, 2, 120).

Provost:

"I do it not in evil disposition,
But from Lord Angelo by special charge."

Claudio has already been censured and condemned to death; so that this exposure to the world on his way to prison is something over and above the penalty; and appears to represent that "note of infamy by way of admonishing others," recommended by Bacon in his 40th aphorism.

When, therefore, Angelo is convicted of an offence, similar to that for which he has condemned Claudio, the duke has to decide whether:

1. "*To save him from the stage and public ignominy.*" (*Life, V*, p. 276).
2. "*To save the lands from forfeiture and the blood from corruption.*" (*Ib.*).
3. "*To save the blood, not from corrupting, but from spilling.*" (*Ib.*).

As Angelo had exposed Claudio to the world on his way to prison, the duke, true to his belief in Measure for Measure, cannot "*save him from the stage and public ignominy.*"

And as, by death, Claudio is unloaded of all he possessed, the duke cannot "*save the lands from forfeiture,*"

"For his possessions . . . by confiscation they are ours."
(*V*, 1, 428).

Neither can he "*save the blood from spilling,*" because

"Friend or brother,
He forfeits his own blood that spills another."
(*Timon, III*, 5, 88).

And because Angelo had given special order that Claudio should be executed with unseemly haste,

"We do condemn thee to the very block
Where Claudio stoop'd to death, and with like haste."
(*V*, 1, 420).

Thus we see that the ensnaring penal law with which

Angelo ensnared Claudio, in the end entrapped himself; making good Bacon's maxim, *"The more laws we make the more snares we lay to entrap ourselves."*

(*Life*, *III*, p. 19).

"I told ye all
When we first put this dangerous stone a-rolling
'Twould fall upon ourselves."

(*H8*, *V*, 3, 103).

From aphorism 35:—

"Courts of equity should have power as well to abate the rigour of the law as to supply its defects."

Instead of using his power to abate the rigour of the law, Angelo prefers to play the tyrant. When his proclamation was sent forth, *"it looked extremely back, which is against all justice."* (*Life*, *III*, p. 285.) Juliet was "very near her hour" (*II*, 2, 15); and as our gestation period is roughly nine months, it looked back nearly as far as was possible; nine months all but this near hour.

"First, for the ordinance which his Majesty may establish herein, I wish it may not look back upon any offence past; for that strikes before it warns" (*Life*, *IV*, p. 397); *"and in our proceeding with the persons, first to warn before we punish."* (*Life*, *III*, p. 387).

Now the very essence of Caludio's complaint is that not only does this new governor "awake me all the enroll'd penalties," etc., but, "for a name, now puts the drowsy and neglected act freshly on me," which clearly means without warning.

However, until Angelo fell in love with Isabel he never once departed from the laws of Aristotle and of Bacon; so that no man could find fault with him except on the ground of tyranny and cruelty.

After defeating Isabel on points of law, she in turn defeats him; where he says, "This virtuous maid subdues me quite."

(*II*, 2, 185).

Up till now he fancied himself immune from the instincts of ordinary men:

"Ever till now
When men were fond, I smil'd and wonder'd how."
(*Ib.*, 186).

But, as Bacon says, the greatest virtue is tried in action; and this brings us to those portions of Bacon's 'Essay of Love,' which were not published before 1625.

With time and opportunity Angelo falls like some other eminent men; and thus we see that "the dribbling dart of love can pierce a complete bosom," (*Meas.*, *I*, 3, 2); or, as Bacon says, "*the mad degree of love can find entrance into a heart well fortified if watch be not kept.*" (*Essay X.*) Angelo falls a victim to Isabel much in the same way that Appius Claudius fell a victim to Virginia; and there can be little doubt that when the author of *Measure for Measure* wrote: "But that frailty hath examples for his falling, I should wonder at Angelo" (*III*, 1, 190), he had in mind Marcus Antonius and Appius Claudius. In those three additional paragraphs which Bacon published in the 1625 edition of his 'Essay of Love' (the first two and the last) he speaks of these two men as exceptions to a rule; and of the charitable nature of friars. He describes Marcus Antonius as "*voluptuous and inordinate*"; and Shakespeare speaks of his "voluptuousness" and "full surfeits" (*Antony and Cleopatra*, *I*, 4, 25); and a man of full surfeits in an inordinate man.

Let us now compare the portraits of Appius Claudius and Angelo:—

Bacon.	*Shakespeare.*
Essay X, 1625.	*Measure for Measure*, 1623.
"Appius Claudius" (Virginia).	"Angelo"—"Isabel."
"Decemvir and lawgiver."	Self-constituted lawgiver.
"Austere."	"The austereness of my life." (*Meas.*, *II*, 4, 156).
"and wise."	"One so learned and so wise" (*Ib.*, *V*, 1, 475).
"The mad degree of love."	"The dribbling dart of love." (*Ib.*, *I*, 3, 2).
"Can find entrance."	"Can pierce." (*Ib.*, *I*, 3, 3).

"not only into an open heart."	not only "a heart unfortified." (*Ham.*, *I*, 2, 96).
"but also into a heart well fortified."	but also "a complete bosom" (*Meas.*, *I*, 3, 3).
"if watch be not kept."	and did, because watch was not kept.

We see, then, that the portraits of Angelo and Appius Claudius resemble each other to this extent, that both were engaged in the same occupation; each had the same guards, austerity and wisdom, placed about his heart, but these guards fell asleep, or neglected their duty, so that in the one case "the dribbling dart of love," and in the other "the mad degree of love" found easy access, because watch was not kept.

And to complete the analogy between the two authors regarding love and the charitable nature of friars, you will find, in 'Measure for Measure,' Friar Lodowick twice referring to his charitable nature:—

"Bound by my charity, and my blest order,
I come to visit the afflicted spirits
Here in the prison."

(*II*, 3, 3).

Again:—

"Sir, induced by my charity," etc.

(*IV*, 3, 53).

Angelo was what Bacon would term "*a most severe justicer*" (*Life*, *V*, p. 377), and Shakespeare a "most learned justicer." (*Lear*, *III*, 6, 23):

"One so learned and so wise."

(*Meas*, *V*, 1, 475).

This severe and learned justicer has taken pains to convince Isabel that he has not gone beyond the letter of the law in condemning her brother; but now, if she will grant him a request, he, in return, will go on the side of injustice and decree against the statute; and so, by departing from the letter of the law for the first time, he makes himself a legislator and brings about his own downfall, an idea which is based upon Proverbs XXV, 26.

Bacon has two versions of this proverb. In the

"Advancement of Learning" (1605) and in his "De Augmentis" (1623) he writes "*Fons turbatus pede et vena corrupta est justus cadens coram impio*" (A just man falling before the wicked is like a troubled fountain and a corrupted spring); but in his "Essay of Judicature" he writes. "*So saith Solomon, 'Fons turbatus et vena corrupta est justus cadens in causa sua coram adversario'* " (A just man falling before his adversary in his own cause is, etc.).

The author of 'Measure for Measure' seems to make use of both forms; for the duke allows Angelo to be a judge *in causa sua* ("'Be you judge of your own cause'"—*V*, 1, 167), and soon after pulls him down both *coram adversario* (Isabel) and *coram impio* (The wicked citizens of Vienna, "where I have seen corruption boil and bubble till it o'er-run the stew"—*V*, 1, 320).

It would seem that Bacon wrote—not what was actually said but—what he thought Solomon meant. This explanation will be made very evident when we consider his commentary upon Proverbs XXIX, 21.

It is possible that the author of the play had in mind another parable selected by Bacon, which is this:—

> "*Primus in causa sua justus; tum venit altera pars, et inquirit in eum.*" (The first in his own cause seems just, then comes the other party, and inquires into him.) (*De Aug., VIII*, II, parabola XVII);

for this is exactly what happens in 'Measure for Measure.' In the last scene of the play Angelo is first in his own cause, then comes the duke and inquires into him. When Angelo is accused by Isabel he says to the duke, "Her wits, I fear me, are not firm," and even the duke pretends to think her mad. Isabel then implores the duke to do exactly what Bacon says a judge ought to do:—

> "*A judge ought to prepare his way to a just sentence, as God useth to prepare his way, by raising valleys and taking down hills; so when there appeareth on either side a high hand, violent prosecution, cunning advantages taken, combination, power, great counsel, then is the virtue of the judge seen to make inequality equal; that he may plant his judgment as upon an even ground.*" (*Essay* 56).

Isabel:

> "O gracious duke!
> Harp not on that; nor do not banish reason
> For inequality; but let your reason serve.
> To make the truth appear where it seems hid.
> And hide the false seems true."

The word "that" refers to madness. Do not think me mad because of the inequality between me and this great man; but let your reason serve (let your virtue be seen) to make the truth appear (by exalting the valley) where it seems hid, and make low the mountain of falsehood that obstructs your view; in other words, to make inequality equal, that you may plant your judgment as upon an even ground.

At the end of the second act Isabel is made to realise the meaning of inequality, and the magnitude of the falsehood:—

Angelo to Isabel:

> "Say what you can, my false o'erweighs your true."
> (*II*, 4, 170).

Isabel to the audience:

> "Did I tell this, who would believe me?"
> (*II*, 4, 171).

The word 'inequality' is not used elsewhere in the plays; and it has the same meaning as it has in Bacon's essay, and is used regarding the same subject.

In *Henry VIII* (II, 4, 107) Katharine is in similar case. She, too, has in opposition two foxy cardinals: "*A high hand, cunning advantages taken*," and realizes the meaning of inequality when she says:

> "I am a simple woman, much too weak
> To oppose your cunning."

Isabel asks for justice; so does Katharine, and at the same time complains of the absence of equality.

Katharine to Henry VIII:

> "Sir, I desire you do me right and justice;
> . . . . . having here
> No judge indifferent, nor no more assurance
> Of equal friendship and proceeding."
> (*H8*, II, 4, 13).

*"Take care and provide that our subjects have equal and indifferent justice."** (*Life, V*, p. 395).

Note the difference in the order of 'equal,' 'indifferent' and 'justice,' and compare 'equal friendship' with '*equal and indifferent terms and motives of affection.*'

(*Life, III*, p. 205).

When Isabel said, "Yet show some pity" (*Meas., II*, 2, 99); and when Katharine said, "Bestow your pity on me" (*H8, II*, 4, 14), they were both appealing to a supreme equity judge, because the author of their speeches knew as well as Bacon, that the office of a common law judge is to interpret the law, and that the supreme equity judge alone can bestow pity; and when Bacon wrote "*inequality*" he had in mind "Omnis vallis exaltabitur" (*Isaiah XL*, 4), and so had the author of Isabel's words, "Nor do banish reason (in me) for inequality." The word 'for' means 'because of,' as it does in "*Two unfortunate Kings; the one of Edward II, who when he kept himself close for danger, was,*" etc. (*Life, II*, p. 282); and as it does in 'King John'—"Go closely in with me: much danger do I undergo for thee" (*IV*, 1, 134). Suppose your earthly judge should fail you; why then you must "*refer all your oppressions, afflictions and injuries to the even-balanced eye of the Almighty.*" (*Nashe, V*, p. 175). This "even-balanced eye" comes "*by raising valleys and taking down hills,*" . . . "*to make inequality equal; that he may plant his judgment as upon an even ground*"; and so we conclude that Bacon, Shakespeare and Nashe were equally interested in the fourth verse of the fortieth chapter of Isaiah.

"For the advocates and counsel that plead, patience and gravity of hearing is an essential part of justice."

(*Essay* 56,—1625).

Angelo pleading:

"Now, good my lord, give me the scope of justice;
My patience here is touched."

(*V*, I, 235).

"My gravity, wherein—let no man hear me—I take pride." (II, 4, 9).

---

* The prayer for the Church militant has "truly and indifferently minister justice."

Why does Angelo lose patience? It is because the inequality in power between himself and Isabel is made less unequal by the appearance of Mariana as a witness on the part of Isabel.

This precept concerning patience and gravity of hearing is the last of a series laid down by Bacon in those 25 lines of his 'Essay of Judicature,' beginning with "*A judge ought to prepare.*" While reading the play, you will probably notice that the author puts Isabel forward to advance some of these precepts; and you will not be long in discovering that Angelo, the "corrupt deputy," during his brief authority, goes contrary to every one of them. He does not attempt to make inequality equal; he turns into rigour that which was meant for terror; he awakes a sleeping law, and strikes at Claudio without warning. Isabel appeals for mercy, and he turns a deaf ear; she pleads for a severe eye upon the example, and a merciful eye upon her brother, but cannot move him; and towards the end, as we have just seen, he loses that patience which Bacon says is an essential part of justice.

BACON-SHAKESPEARE AND THE STARS (I).

MANY more people seek their Destiny (or Hitler's) in the Stars as interpreted by modern astrologers than listen to the voice of organized religion. The star gazer has taken the place of the sky pilot and indeed, so far as women are concerned, the prophecies of Naylor, Lyndoe, Ann Maritza and Archidamus are at least equally as influential as anything else that appears in the columns of the newspapers—Mr. Churchill's speeches alone perhaps excepted.

What did Shakespeare think of astrology? Although "In the traditions of Astrology," writes Bacon (Works V, p. 21), "men's" natures and dispositions are not unaptly distinguished according to the predominances of the planets—lovers of quiet, lovers of action, lovers of victory, lovers of honour, lovers of pleasure, lovers of arts, lovers of change and so forth—yet "astrology is in most parts without foundation even." (Works IV, 347). "It is so full of superstition that scarce anything sound can be discovered in it." (*Ibid*, 349.) "One might as well bring back auguries and believe in divination, entrails and all kinds of fables, for all these are set forth as the dictates of long experience and tradition" as astrology is maintained to be. "Whosoever shall entertain high and vaporous imaginations instead of a laborious and sober inquiry of truth shall beget hopes and beliefs of strange and impossible shapes." (III, 362.) One has only to read the Sunday newspapers to appreciate the truth of this! "Nevertheless the end or pretence of Astrology is noble. For it pretendeth to discover that correspondence which is between the superior globe and the inferior. . . But the derivations and prosecutions to these ends, both in the theories and the practices, are full of error and vanity which the great professors themselves have sought to veil over and conceal by enigmatical writings and referring

themselves to auricular traditions and such other devices to save the credit of impostures." (Works III, 289.)

Notwithstanding "I would rather have it," proceeds Bacon, "purified than altogether rejected. . . I admit astrology as a part of Physic (i.e. science) and yet attribute to it nothing more than is allowed by reason and the evidence of things, all fictions and superstitions being set aside."

What does Bacon think fiction and superstition? That each of the planets reigns in turn for an hour is an "idle invention: the doctrine of horoscopes and the distribution of houses is idle superstition and that the hour of nativity or conception influences the fortune or the hour of commencement influences the fortune of enterprise—these things have for the most part nothing sure or solid and are plainly refuted by physical reasons." (Works IV, 350.)

After laying down certain rules by which, he writes, astrological matters may be examined, the last of which is that there is no fatal necessity in the stars, but that they rather incline than compel, Bacon "sets down as a desideratum—a sane Astrology which may be applied more confidently to predictions and which may be made not only of comets, meteors and the weather, but of harvests, wars, seditions or greater revolutions of things natural as well as civil and even to an individual's health." (*Ibid*, 353.)

He approves the doctrine of the greater revolutions (i.e. rotations—the period made by the regular recurrence of a measure of time or by a succession of similar events)—"there is," he says, "the manifest heat of the sun and the magnetic influence of the moon on the half monthly tides, but the powers of the rest of the planets even in the greater revolutions are weak and slight and are almost invisible. If these have so little influence, minute differences of position have no power at all.

"To do themselves justice, astrologers may faithfully extract from history all the greater disasters and may examine not according to the subtleties of horoscopes, but by the rules of revolutions what the position of the heavenly

bodies was at the times, so that when there is found a manifest agreement and coincidence of events, then a probable rule of prediction may be established." (*Ibid*, 355.)

Bacon, then, seems to have believed to some extent in astrology as a branch of astronomical science (for centuries astronomy and astrology were identified) but it is not easy to understand if one is prepared, as he was, to admit the influence of the Planets upon our lives, why this should not operate in small things as in great—if wars, revolutions, etc., can be foretold with the fate of nations by reference to the position of the planetary bodies, why not the birth, marriage and death of an individual or even the advent of the Dark Lady from over the water?

However, Shakespeare thinks in the same way. He uses the word "revolution" in the same technical sense as Bacon. In "*Anthony and Cleopatra*," I, 2, we find:

> "The present pleasure,
> By revolution lowering, does become
> The opposite of itself."

As Warburton pointed out, the allusion is to the Sun's diurnal course: which, rising in the East, and, by revolution, lowering or setting becomes the opposite of itself.

Shakespeare pokes fun at the ideas that the planets influence character and temperament. Beatrice jests that a star danced and under that she was born. Benedict tells Margaret he was not born under a rhyming planet and moreover Shakespeare indicates that it is as impossible as for the sun to borrow from the moon as to foretell events ("*Troilus and Cressida*," V, 1)

Sonnet XIV summarizes the Bacon-Shakespeare view:

> "Not from the stars do I my judgment pluck;
> And yet methinks I have astronomy
> But not to tell of good or evil luck,
> Of plagues, of dearths, of season's quality;
> Nor can I fortune to brief minutes tell,
> Pointing to each his thunder, rain and wind
> Or say with princes if it shall go well
> By oft predict what I in heaven find."

Here we have Bacon's idea that predictions on a large scale might be possible, but he wanted to treat the subject scientifically.

> "O learn'd indeed were that astronomer
> That knew the stars as I his character
> He'd lay the future open." (*Cym.*, III, 2.)

Imogen is referring to her husband's handwriting. How well she knows it! How learned an astrologer must be, she means, to read the stars as clearly—so learned he would lay the future open! Impossible to be so learned. As impossible to foretell the future.

In "*King Lear*," I, 2, Shakespeare refers to the "fatalities," the hour of nativity or conception and ridicules the folly of belief in planetary influence upon them. "When we are sick in fortune (often the surfeit of our own behaviour) we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon and the stars: as if we were villains by necessity; fools by heavenly compulsion; knaves, thieves and treachers by spherical predominance, drunkards, liars and adulterers by an enforced obedience of planetary influence; and all that we are evil in, by a divine thrusting on: an admirable evasion of whoremaster man to lay his goatish disposition to the charge of a star!" (King Lear, I, 2.)

Edmund, whose birth was illegitimate, proceeds: "My father compounded with my mother under the dragon's tail; and my nativity was under Ursa Major; so that it follows, I am rough and lecherous. Tut, I should have been that I am had the maidenest star in all the firmament twinkled on my bastardising." How far the sceptical Edmund expresses the Dramatist's own view is, of course, doubtful. He is answering in soliloquy his father who unfortunately left the stage and the latter does not reply. Gloster had said that "eclipses in the sun and moon portend no good to us: though the wisdom of nature can reason it thus, yet nature finds itself scourged by the sequent effects: love cools, friendship falls off, brothers divide: in cities, mutinies; in countries, discord; in

palaces, treason. This villain of mine comes under the prediction: there's son against father.''

Note that Gloster is entirely wrong: Edgar certainly does not come under any such prediction: he was a true and loyal son: it is Edmund the sceptic whom Gloster does not suspect and who is ''son against father.''

Gloster proceeds: ''the king falls from bias of nature; there's father against child. We have seen the best of our time: machinations, hollowness, treachery, and all ruinous disorders follow us disquietly to our graves.'' All this has a curiously modern ring. It might have been written to-day—if there were any Poet-Dramatist who could write ''*King Lear*.'' Surely Shakespeare was for all time!

He, like Bacon, believed that the celestial bodies exercised influences other than those of Light and heat: it is in the affairs of nations we must look for these and in the lives of the Great for ''when beggars die there are no comets seen; the heavens themselves blaze forth the death of princes.'' (''*Julius Caesar*.'') And once more in ''*Troilus and Cressida*'':

> ''When the planets
> In evil mixture, to disorder wander,
> What plagues and what portents! What meeting!
> What raging of the Sea! shaking of earth!
> Commotion in the winds, frights, changes, horrors
> Divert and crack, rend and deracinate
> The unity and married calm of states
> Quite from their fixture.''

The idea is that we should only regard natural phenomena in predictions founded on astrology on a broad base, both as to time and people—the rest is ''the excellent foppery of the world.''

BACON OR SHAKSPERE: DOES IT MATTER?

By Howard S. Bridgewater.

MANY people with whom one discusses the "Shakespeare" plays express indifference as to the authorship question. "Does it really matter?" they ask, "who wrote them? We have the plays" they say, "and that is the great thing." They often add that normal people do not welcome revolutionary ideas. "The average man," they say "has more than enough of problems to occupy him, and will not thank you for raising another one—this theory that the "Shakespeare" plays were written by Francis Bacon; its acceptance necessarily entails the shattering of yet another illusion. "Is there," they exclaim, "to be left nothing in which we may believe? If there is one thing which so far we have not doubted it is that Shakespeare wrote the plays attributable to him. Of course Shakspere wrote Shakespeare!"

In presenting this picture of the average man's reaction to the subject, I wish to suggest that this not unreasonable view of the matter should be borne in mind as calculated to make Baconians more sympathetic with the attitude so frequently adopted, both by individuals and the Press, towards their theory. It explains, of course, the willingness of almost any newspaper Editor to publish any nonsense about "Shakespeare" provided only that it can, by any conceivable flight of fancy, be construed as supporting the orthodox theory, and the vested interests, academic and commercial, which have sprung from it.

Well, does it really matter that the public should know that the Plays were the work of a cultured philosopher and not that of a "deserving man player" whose life history (so far as his many would-be biographers have been able to reconstruct it) is such that it cannot be brought into any kind of harmony with the work, except by a miracle? There is no escape from the conviction that only by belief in a miracle can Shakspere of Stratford be believed to be the Shakespeare of the world.

But is there any harm in believing in a miracle? If

people like to believe in miracles, as undoubtedly a good many do, why seek to destroy their credulity? As Mark Twain said "There's mountains of history to prove that the human being will not take the real thing when he can get a fetish in place of it." And some of these fetish traditions are harmless enough, that of King Alfred and the cakes, for example. They often point a pretty little moral for children. But while there is perhaps something not altogether unattractive in the idea of a deer-stealing peasant becoming a great poet—something complimentary to the hoi polloi—this Stratford tradition detracts from the study of the Plays, for the reason that the public is not quite satisfied that such a man's work can really be looked to as a fount of Wisdom, Knowledge of human nature and the acme of literary expression. People who in their youth have become compulsorily acquainted with "Shakespeare" are consciously or unconsciously affected by the unsatisfying story of the alleged author's life, and are not inspired, in later years, to read his books, when they can bring to the great dramas their own experience of life. Their impression of the author is that of a man who may or may not have had such educational advantage even as that offered by the local Grammar School, and as being the offspring of illiterate farming folk, and their natural sense of logic repels the idea that, even with the aid of inspiration, he could have written anything so very wonderful, despite the admiration for his work which they hear whenever it is discussed.

In emphasis of the mischief thus wrought by the Stratford myth, I would remind you that so good a judge as Samuel Taylor Coleridge considered "Shakespeare" to be the work of all others calculated "to make readers better as well as wiser." The importance of the authorship question is thus, upon one foundation, established.

I shall now demonstrate not only that this Stratford image is an evil thing by reason of its first consequence but that its presence in the minds of those who, nevertheless become students of the Plays, exerts constantly a pernicious influence: that it emboldens pseudo literary critics to allow themselves a liberty of criticism which

they would not otherwise dare to take: and that this results in senseless, vainglorious and derogatory comment of that great Genius who lifted English literature from utter mediocrity to a height it has never since attained

As my first witness I shall subpoena Prof. Caroline Spurgeon, who, as I shall show, as a direct result of her acceptance of the "butcher's apprentice" origin of the authorship of the plays, has used her talent and opportunities only to bring our master poet into ridicule and contempt.

Some few years ago a lecture was given in London by this lady. It was delivered before the British Academy and was described as "The 'Shakespeare' Lecture." Well, what sort of a lecture was it? Did Prof. Caroline Spurgeon take advantage of the occsasion to draw attention to those manifold beauties of expression that make "Shakespeare" the diamond of English literature, or to examples illustrating the profundity of the author's philosophic wisdom and general erudition? No: she did not. Prof. Caroline Spurgeon entitled her lecture "Iterative Imagery," and proceeded to relate how by collecting and comparing references to various matters discussed in the Plays it was possible to arrive at conclusions concerning the character, disposition and habits of the author. Quite so; and impartially pursued by an investigator unhandicapped by the miracle theory, such a study might yield extremely interesting and informative results. It might for example lead to the opinion that the author must have been an aristocrat, judging by the many occasions when he makes disparaging references to the rabble: that the extraordinary frequency of the legal allusions in "Shakespeare" would denote him to have been a legal luminary of the highest standing, etc. Such conclusions would be inevitable and would, I contend, lead to enhanced interest in the work.

But what is the conclusion to which Prof. Caroline Spurgeon came? She arrived at the opinion, after, as she says, having assembled and classified hundreds of references—that the author of the Plays may be assumed to have been "a handy man about the house!" In my view,

that is about as preposterous a misinterpretation of the facts which, properly applied, her own method of study would have produced, as it would be possible to imagine. Yet that lecture is applauded: yet *The Times* could find space in which to report it with "Shakespeare, As A Handy Man About the House" set out in bold type as a "catch" line thereto, and with no comment, such as one might have expected to see in a paper having some pretensions to literary criticism, pouring ridicule upon the conception. And *The Times* refrained from publishing a letter that I wrote drawing attention to its obvious absurdity. To revert to the Professor, I would suggest that only a mind impregnated with, and warped by, the impression of the author of the immortal Plays as a miraculously transformed farm labourer's son, could possibly have derived from study of them so ridiculous a conclusion. Professor Spurgeon also inferred that the author disliked bad smells from the fact that he described sin and evil deeds as smelling foully; the value of which discovery presumably lies in the manner in which the author of the Plays may be distinguished from the common herd of poets who so often express their appreciation of foul smells! Without wishing to be too severe one might say that it would not demand much labour by way of assembling, comparing and dissecting *her* work to enable one to arrive at the opinion that she is lamentably wanting in all sense of logic as well as suffering from the "Shakespeare" Miracle-theory complex. To enable you to understand how the Professor's view that "Shakespeare was a handy man about the house" was arrived at, I should mention that it was done by the assembling and classifying of references "indicating in the author a knowledge of carpentry and other handicrafts"! There are, of course, allusions to such things in "Shakespeare" but one has hardly the requisite patience to point out that, for every one of the kind, Professor Spurgeon could herself have pointed to dozens indicative of the fact that that is precisely the kind of man which the author was not.

If it be fair to say that this idea can have been born only of the orthodox butcher's-apprentice conception of the

origin of the author, then I have proved my point that the authorship question does indeed matter: unless we are to take the view that it doesn't matter at all what nonsense is written about anyone or anything.

Another example of the sort of criticism, derogatory, as I think, to the study of "Shakespeare," is contained in a little book entitled "William Shakespeare," written by John Masefield, the Poet Laureate—as I hope, in his "salad" days. It is certainly written with all the cocksureness of a young man. Incidentally he says some excellent things, as for example that "it is simply a wild surmise that Shakspur was a lawyer's clerk or a country schoolmaster." Again he says very truly "Legends are a stupid man's excuse for his want of understanding. Setting aside the legends, the lies, the surmises and the imputations, several uninteresting things are known about him" (Shakspere).

Here we seem to have a budding Baconian, but having explained that "Shakspere got with child a woman named Anne or Agnes Hathaway, eight years older than himself" and that "Her relatives saw to it that he married her: that twins were born to him, and at this point he "disappears," he nevertheless accepts various other legends, stating as a fact, instead of an assumption, that "he began to show a talent for improving the plays of others," and then, plunging headlong into the vortex of the miracle theory (in which he was no doubt reared), remarks that "Nothing interesting is known of his subsequent life except that he wrote great poetry and made money by it." The erroneous idea that the immortal plays were written primarily as a means of money-making is naturally characteristic of many of the orthodox critics.

Masefield then proceeds to criticise various of the Plays In dealing with "*Love's Labour's Lost*" he writes:—"Shakespeare came from the country. In the country a thinking man is reminded daily of the shrewdness of unspoiled minds" . . . . and a little lower down he says "It is interesting to see Shakespear's mind trying for vividness." And "In this early play one can see his first conscious literary efforts towards the obtaining of power."

It will be seen here how the miracle theory emboldens relatively diminutive literary lights to allow themselves a liberty of criticism which they would not otherwise dare to take. I cite these remarks of Masefield as a case in point. Masefield himself has never written anything to equal "*Love's Labour's Lost.*" We would, I think, rather lose all the excellent works of the present Poet Laureate than *Love's Labour's Lost*, which is full of delightful lyrics, and witty and philosophic dialogue. The first line of it is recited by the King of Navarre and runs:—"Let fame, that all hunt after in their lives."

I attribute quite a number of these liberties that so many modern writers delight to take with "Shakespeare" to that same hunt after fame. A good many people take us at our own estimation and I think this kind of criticism is dictated by the desire to appear great enough to criticise even "Shakespeare." It is, of course, audacity that would not be countenanced but for the prevalence of the Stratford authorship impression.

But I write really more in sorrow than anger of John Masefield, for, apart from that lapse, which, as I have explained is directly due to the operation of the Stratford authorship idea, he writes more appreciatively and illuminatingly of the immortal works than nine out of ten of the best critics, whether orthodox or not.

And we must forgive him much for his desription of the author of "Shakespeare" as "the seer of the eternal in life," and for the following reference to the pseudo portraits of Shakspere. He says "There are many graven images of Shakespeare. They are perhaps passable portraits of the languid half-witted hydrocephalic creatures who made them. As representations of a bustling, brilliant, profound, vivacious being, alive to the finger tips, and quick with an energy never since granted to man (which is almost exactly Macaulay's description of Bacon) they are as false as water."

Before crossing swords with the next critic on my list, I would like, for the benefit of all of them, to point to the fact that that brilliant playwright, Mr. Sean O'Casey, recently asserted* that "You can't write except from

* In the course of an interview published in the *Daily Chronicle*.

within your experience, and that Shakespeare and Milton were no exceptions to that," and that "a hard bringing-up is no help to a writer, but the contrary."

I would commend those remarks especially to the Editor of the *Morning Post*, in which paper a leading article appeared (May 28th, 1931), entitled "A Masterpiece Explained." This article which dealt with a recently published book on "*Don Quixote*," written by Prof. Paul Hazard, contained the statement that "The maker of masterpieces is educated by life, which is not learnt in the Universities." Admitting that a University or any other education, however valuable, will be of less value to a man living a secluded life, than to one who has travelled and suffered the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" what the *Morning Post* fails to appreciate is that all the experience in the world is quite useless as an asset for a poet and philosopher, if he does not at the same time possess the high degree of education requisite to enable him to give it expression. However rugged may be the life experience of a poet, it cannot obviously supply him, sans education, with a profound knowledge of Law, Science, History, Botany, Medicine, etc., such as is displayed by "Shakespeare." It is true that with a relatively meagre education you may get a Burns to sing gracefully of such matters as a "*Cottar's Saturday Night*," but you will not that way get Omar Khayam or "Shakespeare." The *Morning Post* goes on to say of Prof. Hazard's "*Don Quixote*" that "This admirable scholar has discovered little that is new as to the actual facts of 'The Life of Cervantes,' who remains," says the *Post*, "almost as much a mystery (and miracle) of the Renaissance as our own Shakespeare." So you see how definitely the *Morning Post* is committed to the miracle explanation of the genius of "Shakespeare," as also, again, what illogical comment that theory provokes. "Why," may I ask, "If the maker of masterpieces is educated by life, which is not learnt at the Universities," should "Shakespeare" be regarded as a miracle? Isn't it precisely because of the author's lack of educational opportunities that Shakespeare is regarded by the *Morning Post* itself as a miraculous work?

To be continued.

FRANCIS BACON—A NEW PORTRAIT?

ABOUT three months ago I had a letter from an old friend of mine living in the country. "I have," he wrote, "what I think may be an original portrait of Francis Bacon. It is extremely powerful and I should like you to see it." I replied at once, and a week later he brought the panel to Town, meeting me at my club where he sought a quiet corner. The picture, carefully wrapped, he kept beside him until we had finished our coffee; meantime my friend whetted my curiosity with one or two details. It seems he had had the portrait at at his country house for some years, but had not bothered himself with its cleaning, until recently when a collector expressed a wish to acquire it. My friend took the panel to a restorer in London who removed the old grime-laden varnish. This process discovered an inscription on the face of the panel, painted on the dark background over the head of the subject: FRANCISCUS DE VERULAMIO ANNO 1619. My friend naturally intrigued by such an appearance, reserved judgment on such an identity for others, he himself being somewhat dubious as to attribution by inscription only.

Coffee over, the portrait was unwrapped and placed on the mantelshelf by a strong electric light. My first reaction was one of shock; my gaze focussed on the eyes and the eyes alone! Here undoubtedly was the presentment of a face of extraordinary power and character . . . as to it being Bacon himself I could not at once decide, yet I was irresistibly *reminded* of Bacon, helped no doubt by the illusion of the 'spade' beard but at the same time puzzled by the fact that the known portraits of him showed Bacon wearing a high-crowned black hat from beneath which his long hair (? a wig) fell luxuriantly upon his ruff.

Later in the evening, at home, I could not get this face out of my head—the *eyes* were with me still, and acting

PANEL INSCRIBED 'FRANCISCUS DE VERULAMIS ANNO 1619'
IN THE POSSESSION OF ALAN KEEN.

PRINT, UPON WHICH HAT AND HAIR HAVE BEEN PRINTED IN.

on impulse I went to my bookshelves to find a book on Bacon. Perhaps a biography would outline his more outstanding physical characteristics. Then Charles Williams' work, *Bacon**, supplied the first clue. On page 11 was quoted of Bacon's eyes, "*delicate, lively, hazel eyes*" (*viper eyes,' Harvey called them, but Harvey did not love him*')". And on pages 216-217 a further possible clue presented itself. Williams writes ". . . . in the July of 1618 he was raised to the nobility under the title of Verulam." After which the author discusses the many prodigal expenditures of the newly created Earl, among which is the mention of a portrait, "The Picture drawer for your Lordship's picture took £33." A great sum indeed for that time! That 'Picture drawer' must have been of some note and deeply skilled in his craft, I argued with myself, to have received such a fee. Could this be our picture?

The next step was a further meeting with my friend, stimulated, I must confess, with an urgent desire to possess this picture myself.

My friend had since our first conversation sought expert opinion. One such expert (far removed from art dealing) had said "I cannot accept this as a portrait of Bacon."" Another expressed the opinion that the inscription had been added at a later date. These did not dismay me at all, particularly the latter; indeed it was the invariable practice of old-time 'finishers' and framers, who were also limners, to identify the subject (presumably by instruction from the painter or the subject's family) by lettering an appropriate name and date on some part of the background of panel or canvas. The Holbein drawings, now preserved in the Royal collections at Windsor, provide a case in point. Made in the first part of the sixteenth century, the identity of the sitters was lettered upon the drawings themselves during the century following.

As I seem to be using up overmuch precious 'wartime

* Bacon, by Charles Williams. Arthur Barker, Ltd., London. 1933.

space,' let me briefly chronicle the known facts relating to this interesting and as yet unverified portrait, that readers of *Baconiana* more versed than I in matters Baconian may reach their own conclusions.

(a) The portrait is on an oaken panel approximately 12 inches by 14¾ inches deep. The painting is entirely original and according to the restorer has never been retouched or interfered with in any way.

(b) The beard and moustaches are of a reddish-brown hue greying at the outer edges. The eyes are unmistakeably hazel.

(c) The history of the panel is quite unknown as is its ownership prior to that of my friend.

(d) My wife, a competent student of sculpture before her marriage, is satisfied that the bone-structure and measurements of the head and features correspond to those of the known portraits of Bacon, but more especially in the familiar bust of Francis Bacon as a boy, a reproduction of which serves as frontispiece to Mr. Williams' volume.

(e) The present panel depicts Bacon in the unfamiliar state of being without hat and hair. I do not know whether Bacon was in the habit of wearing a wig, but I do know from association with a relative who happens to be a barrister that many lawyers lose their hair in middle-life, an incident probably due to the frequent wearing of the legal wig during long sessions in court. It is not therefore improbable that Francis Bacon was painted without either 'dress' or legal wig in 1619; in *neglige* as it were, at Gorhambury during some holiday period. He had then attained the object of his desire, and could relax that formality of attire which seems to be insisted upon by the world where 'rising men' are concerned.

I have myself painted in a high-crowned hat and hair beneath, upon a photographic print of the original for comparison with Marshall's engraved portrait of 1640.

The resemblance is there . . . the eyes, nose and other features are in keeping with the accepted lineaments of the great philosopher. But in this new original—if an original portrait of Bacon it be, we are allowed to see something of that hidden worry, of those years of frustration which have left their mark upon the brow and expression of the ageing man.

As to the painter, my friend has suggested that this may be the work of Mierevelt. To this Mr. R. L. Eagle remarks in a recent letter to me, 'you mentioned Mierevelt as the probable painter of the panel. I resume you refer to the father Michael and not the son Peter, born 1595. Michael lived at Delft, 1567-1641. One short biography I turned up did not mention a visit to England, but when I have an opportunity I will consult a better authority.'

To Mr. Eagle I am further indebted for bringing this material to the notice of the Editor of BACONIANA. I trust that more light may be thrown upon the panel in the future and that in the end we may find acceptance of the theory that here at last we have something better than the flattering brush of Van Somer, to bring us closer to the 'true portraiture' of Francis Bacon, colossus of the Elizabethans.

ALAN KEEN,
June, 1941.

NOTES AND NOTICES.

It was one of those strange accidents of history, which are probably no accident at all but the result of men's minds quietly adapting themselves to the changing forces and pressures of the day, that, in the same generation, while Montaigne was writing in France, Francis Bacon was laying the foundations of the essay over here.

I said earlier that the subject of the ordinary essay was often trivial and unimportant; and it is one of the freaks of literary history that Francis Bacon, who at one remove brought the essay into fully-flowered and finished form, happened to have a mind that couldn't be trivial, that refused to dwell on the unimportant.

Every schoolboy knows the subjects on which he wrote—*Of Truth*, *Of Death*, *Of Envy*, *Of Love*, *Of Nobility*, *Of Beauty*, *Of Gardens*, and so forth in sedate and dignified succession.

But it is interesting to think about those titles for a moment: obviously, no one, not even Francis Bacon, . . . could attempt to write fully and exhaustively on such subjects: they are topics to defeat an Academy of giants. But the most that mortal man could contrive, Bacon managed; and in the result he has given us his richly-pondered commentary on life, an anthology, in fact, of his own profound remarks.

The opening sentences of the essays *of Truth* and *of Gardens* have entered into the language like the more familiar quotations from Shakespeare: they need no reproduction in the pages of this journal. But turn to the essay *of Superstition*. "It were better to have no opinion of God at all," he writes, "than such an opinion as is unworthy of him"—and the reader knows the voice of a great old man is beginning. Or turn to his essay "*Of Great Places*": here is the Lord Chancellor himself, with his wig off and his robe undone, grousing quietly and

philosophically to himself in a corner—and longing to be overheard. "Men in great places are thrice servants," he complains, "servants of the sovereign or State, servants of fame and servants of business: so that they have no freedom, neither in their persons, nor in their actions, nor in their times. It is a strange desire to seek power and to lose liberty."

An Essay on the Essay, by NORMAN COLLINS, in *John o' London's Weekly*.

Nature exists for man and everything in nature echoes man's better self, ennobling him: such is the leitmotif of the Red Army Theatre's production of Shakespeare's "Midsummer Night's Dream," which had its premiere in that theatre a few days ago.

"Departing from the usual idyllic interpretation of the comedy as a world of romantic fancy, we have endeavoured to bring out the elements of reality clothed by the great English dramatist in abstract forms," A. Popov, art director of the theatre, told *Moscow News*.

A number of important problems, however, have not yet been solved. While the theatre has succeeded in reproducing the epoch in the Shakespeare play, the professor considered that the next task should be a more subtle analysis of the local environment, an endeavour to reproduce not the historically authentic epoch, but the playwright's own perception of the given epoch. Shakespeare's Italy is not the exact Italy of the 16th century, but the Italy as the great Englishman saw it in his mind's eye. The same applies to the world of antiquity and medieval England.

Considerable interest was aroused by Professor A. A. Smirnov's paper on "Shakespeare, the Renaissance and the Baroque Style." This is a subject of particular concern to Shakespeare scholars. The transition from the bright, sunny comedies to the gloomy tragedies is evidence not only of a break in Shakespeare's style, but also showed that the playwright became imbued with a sense of impending catastrophe. This gave some the grounds for

maintaining that the period of great tragedies was the Baroque period in Shakespeare's art.

Professor Smirnov decidedly rejected this viewpoint. In his opinion, the Baroque style signifies the ideological abandonment of Renaissance, the assertion that truth is unknowable. In Shakespeare the meaning of the change in his art is quite different: it signifies the birth of a new world outlook, the appearance of a critical attitude which determines all his views on life and man.

Not the capitulation of reason, as is characteristic of all Baroque artists, but an understanding that the ideas of the Renaissance have suffered a fiasco and that truth and good can be attained only through persistent and hard struggle which unavoidably calls for sacrifices—such is the meaning of this change in Shakespeare's art. And proceeding from this standpoint, Professor Smirnov declared that there was a note of optimism even in Shakespeare's most gloomy tragedies.

An outstanding event at the conference was Professor I. I. Sollertinsky's (Leningrad) paper on the problems of Shakespeare and music. In his opinion, Beethoven's symphony music is not adaptable for the stage for the reason that the great composer did not possess the art of character delineation. According to the professor, Mozart and Verdi came closest in music to Shakespeare's principles of drama.

"The love story of the two couples Hermia and Lysander and Helena and Demetrius is enacted in the midst of the virgin forest inhabited by the spirits of Nature, and all the vissicitudes of fate are subordinated to all-conquering love.

"We have tried to produce an atmosphere of freedom and harmony on the stage," the art director said.

A knowledge of the Renaissance period helped the actors to give a full-blooded portrayal of Shakespeare's immortal characters, which have a deep appeal for the Soviet spectator.

"*Midsummer Night's Dream*" cost the Red Army Theatre 300,000 rubles to produce, no expense being spared

to do justice to this immortal comedy. The cast as well as artists, musicians, regisseurs—125 in all—have done their best to insure its success, Popov emphasized.

Moscow News.

A Four-day Shakespeare conference, attended by regisseurs, actors, playwrights and Shakespeare scholars from all parts of the Soviet Union, took place in Moscow recently.

Professor M. Morozov, who read a paper on "Basic Problems of Staging Shakespeare Plays," summed up the recent achievements of the Soviet theatre and noted that the majority of Soviet actors are mastering the specific rhythm of Shakespeare plays, that new outstanding interpreters of Shakespeare characters have come to the fore in Moscow and in the provinces and that the works have gained new followers in the national republics of the U.S.S.R.

The three latest productions of "*Hamlet*"—in Voronezh, Novosibirsk and Ryazan—were discussed at the conference. All three productions scored a success. Tickets are sold out 15 or 20 performances in advance, notwithstanding the fact that the play has been performed 25 or 30 times. Conferences of playgoers organized by these theatres to discuss the production were attended by 600 and more. In Ryazan the production was the subject of a heated discussion in two educational institutes and the local press.

The Soviet theatre is striving to delve deeper into the works of the great English dramatist, and, in line with its requirements, the conference decided that the work of the Shakespeare Department of the All-Russian Theatrical Society be reorganized. Every new Shakespeare production in the country is to receive all necessary expert advice and data.

The conference also outlined a number of themes which are to be worked upon by Shakespeare scholars jointly with men of the theatre.

Thus, in more directions than one, Russia points the

way. The plays of Shakespeare are more frequently performed there than in his own country and are, moreover, the *favourite reading* of M. Stalin.

The following appeared in *Notes and Queries*, 3rd May, 1941:—

At a date antecedent to March, 1827, Captain Saunders, a past Mayor of Stratford-on-Avon, made certain extracts from the Council book of the Corporation of Stratford during the period that John Shakespeare, the poet's father, was a member of the municipal body. The entries in the book consulted consist, first, of corporate accounts, commencing with those of John Shakespeare himself whilst filling the office of Chamberlain in 1573, and, second, of the attendance roll of the members of the common-council.

The name of the poet's father was said by Captain Saunders to occur 166 times, under fourteen different modes of orthography, viz.:

Shackesper	4	Shakspeyr	17
Shackespere	3	Shakysper	4
Shacksper	4	Shakyspere	9
Shackspere	2	Shaxpeare	69
Shakespere	13	Shaxper	8
Shaksper	1	Shakxpere	18
Shakspere	5	Shaxspeare	9

ST. VINCENT TROUBRIDGE.

William (who was not, we think, "the poet") to Walter Roche, ex-master of the Stratford Grammar School, was "Shaxbere," to Richard Quiney, his fellow-townsman, he was "Shackspere"; to his "fellow-countryman" Abraham Hurley, he was "Shaxsper"; to Thomas Whittington, of Shottery, he was "Shaxpere," and in the marriage bond of November, 1582, he is "Shagspere." If he could spell his own name and wrote it, he wrote it Shakspere.

The library of the late Mr. W. M. Safford, an American student of the Baconian theory, dispersed at the end of

July, was chiefly remarkable for a representative collection of first editions of Sir Francis Bacon. The most expensive was the Huth copy of the 1606 "Essaies," which, in straightgrain morocco, cost £140. Other editions of the book included those of 1613, in a Grolier Club binding, £26, in old vellum, £28, 1624, £20, another copy, £27—the last three each lacking a preliminary and a final blank —1625, in Bedford calf, the first to contain fifty-eight essays, £22, another copy, £28, and, £20. "Opera," 1623, wanting the preliminary blank, was £76, "A Briefe Discourse, touching the Happie Vnion of the Kingdomes . . ." 1603, £26, "The Tvvoo Bookes of Francis Bacon," Riviere morocco, 1605, £20, another copy, £16, "The Wisdome of the Ancients," 1619, £10, "Instauratio Magna," 1620, c 4 blank, e 3 cancelled, 5½ line errata on e 4, £30, another copy with the errata on the last leaf, lacking blanks, £21, "Historia Vitae," 1623 £12, and, "Apophthegmes," 1625, £13. An interesting collection of sixteenth-century tracts with Ruskin's book-label and in an old hand on the first title, "ffrancis Bacons booke," cost £42.

CORRESPONDENCE.

31, Arundel Road,
Cheam.
13*th July*, 1941.

Dear Mr. Habgood,

I have been seeking information about the Essex bust, referred to in the July BACONIANA, page 253. There is no doubt that it is of the *third* Earl, Robert Devereux, son of the Robert of more famous and notorious memory. He was born 1591 and died 1646, and was a commander of the Parliamentary army in the Civil War. The bust is said to be the work of Caius Gabriel Cibber (Laurence Hutton, "Literary Landmarks of London.") Beresford Chancellor ("Annals of the Strand") says that the bust originally adorned the "Grecian" Coffee House. Forming part of the bust and under it is a tablet which says "This is Devereux Court, 1676." It was about this time that Essex House was pulled down, and the streets and courts laid out. The water-gate at the bottom of Essex Street is all that remains of the great Essex House. This has been so badly damaged by an H.E. bomb, that it would scarcely appear to be repairable.

I am sending you a copy of a letter I have addressed to Desmond MacCarthy concerning his broadcast on George Moore. I am not expecting him to refer to my reminder, but as this gentleman is evidently an admirer of George Moore, it is as well to call his attention to G.M.'s Baconian views.

With kind regards,
Yours sincerely,
R. L. EAGLE.

ENCLOSURE.

31, Arundel Road,
Cheam, Surrey.
10*th July*, 1941.

Desmond MacCarthy, Esq.,
25, Wellington Square, S.W.3.

Dear Sir,

I observe from *The Radio Times* that you are to give a talk on George Moore in the Home Service Programme of Friday evening.

In July, 1929, I had the honour of producing his play, "The Making of an Immortal," with the author attending the first performance. A copy of the programme, with some notes, is enclosed.

When he gave me permission to produce it at an interview in Ebury Street, he told me that he was a convinced Baconian, and that one of the points which impressed him was with regard to certain additions and other emendations which appeared in the First Folio of Shakespeare in 1623, and which were not in the first edition of "Othello" in 1622. Shakspere had been dead six years when the first Quarto of "Othello" appeared. In the Folio there are 160 new lines—some of the best in the play. It can be proved that the Folio text was based on the Quarto because certain printers' errors in the Quarto reappear in the Folio. During the period of rehearsals of "The Making of an Immortal" George Moore wrote to me, as follows:

"You will notice from the correction made in the text that the Mummer's name is throughout misspelt. It should be, as you know, Will Shakspere and not Shakespeare, which was the pseudonym of the poet. You will do well to make this distinction clear to the people of your company. The Mummer should not be addressed as Shakespeare until Jonson imposes the name upon him on page 49. When you are next in London I shall be glad it you will call here in the afternoon, for I should like to talk to you about your discerning criticism of "The Tempest," which I read with much pleasure."

Some years earlier, he wrote, "The first time I heard Bacon mentioned as the possible author of the Plays and Poems, the idea lit up in my brain, and I felt certain that it could not have been the Mummer . . . . The moment it was suggested that Bacon had written them I felt, as many must have felt when they heard for the first time that the earth goes round the sun. Things began to get concentric again; hitherto they had all been eccentric."

It does not seem to be generally known that George Moore supported the Baconian cause, and I thought it probable that you might like to refer to it. I have no doubt that he discussed the subject with his many friends.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) R. L. EAGLE.

8, Park Street,
Taunton, Somerset.
July 19*th*, 1941.

The Editors,
BACONIANA.

Dear Sirs,

Your readers may like to know that a pulpit, the gift of Dr. Julius Caesar, Queen Elizabeth's Italian Physician and friend, stands in St. Catherine's Royal Chapel, Marylebone Parish, Regent's Park. The pulpit and a part of the original Chapel were conveyed to Marylebone, N.W., in 1827, from near the Tower of London. It was built by Queen Matilda in 1148, together with a Hospital for poor folk, and it claims to be the earliest ecclesiastical foundation in London. It has ever since been of special interest to England's Queens, amongst whom the present Chaplain is pleased to count our Queen Mary. The late Hepworth Dixon, in *Story of Bacon's Life*, p. 216, records his marriage on May 10th, 1606, when the Bridal party "rode" to Marylebone Chapel. Should the word "rode" be printed in error for "rowed," and that London's Highway—the River—transported the cavalcade to St. Catherine's Royal Chapel by the Tower? If a Register of the marriage be found, its present Curator has promised to let me know.

There were two Julius Caesars,—father and son,—the latter became the nephew of Francis Bacon by marriage with Anne Bacon, his step-niece. History records a visit paid to Anne and Julius Caesar in their Muswell Hill home, in which one of Bacon's Works was written. Dr. Julius Caesar was a deep student of longevity, a subject in which Bacon was greatly interested. So little is discoverable anent Bacon that I trust this letter may not be considered uninteresting.

Yours faithfully,
ALICIA A. LEITH.

26th August, 1941.

The Editor, BACONIANA.

THE ARMOURY OF OUR ADVERSARIES.

Sirs,

Looking back among my files of newspaper correspondence during the past thirty years, I find there are some ten points which are repeatedly advanced by our opponents on the subject of the Shakespeare authorship. Although these arguments have been met and answered time after time, in newspapers, periodicals, books and the pages of BACONIANA, I think it would be useful, and particularly helpful to new friends and readers, if in the course of the next four issues of BACONIANA a reply to these points were to be made. I have compiled this list:

1. That Bacon's time was too much occupied.
2. That only a player could have written the plays.
3. That Shakspere attended the Grammar School, and Genius did the rest.
4. That there are inaccuracies and anachronisms in the plays which Bacon would have avoided.
5. That Bacon was not an inspired poet as judged by his translation into verse of certain Psalms.
6. That Shakspere of Stratford was known by his contemporaries to have been identical with the poet and dramatist.
7. That nobody gave away the secret.
8. That Shakspere was an "actor-manager" and on terms of friendship with Lord Southampton.
9. That the styles of Bacon and of Shakespeare are widely different.
10. That Bacon lacked humour.

This list is not, by any means, exhaustive. There is, for instance, that sheet-anchor of the Stratfordian faith, the First Folio prefatory matter, and the innumerable misprints and other signs of haste and carelessness throughout the text of the plays.

The suggested series of articles dealing with these points should not be confined to BACONIANA. While the type is set up some 250 extra copies of the articles should be printed and, on completion of the series, bound into an attractive pamphlet. I feel sure the benefit would far exceed the expense.

Yours faithfully,

PROSPERO.

(We think that an adequate reply to these Ten Points of our adversaries would occupy more than four entire issues of BACONIANA. We should, however, welcome contributions from our readers, and a series of pamphlets bearing a general title "Objections Overruled" might be prepared.—ED.)

WHO WROTE LOVE'S LABOUR LOST?

"BACONIANA" PRIZE COMPETITION.

Two prizes, the first of £10 10s. 0d. and a second which will only be awarded if there are six or more competitors, of £5 5s. 0d., are offered by the Council of the Bacon Society for the best essays entitled "Shakspere and not Bacon wrote '*Love's Labour's Lost*'."

RULES.

Competitors must discuss the following points:—

(a) The origin of much of the humour of "*Love's Labour's Lost*" in Gray's Inn gossip and slang;

(b) The opinion of Dr. Dover Wilson that to credit "that amazing piece of virtuosity to a butcher boy who left school at thirteen or even to one whose education was only what a grammar school and residence in a little provincial borough could provide is to invite one either to believe in miracles or to disbelieve in the man from Stratford";

(d) The dramatist's acquaintance with the contemporary history of the French Court, its personnel and diplomacy.

Essays must not exceed 1,500 words and must be typewritten on one side of the paper only.

The author's full name, address and occupation must be stated and each essay must be accompanied by the coupon detached from this page.

Essays should reach the office of BACONIANA, 4a, Queen Square, Bath, by registered post, by the 31st January, 1942, and the result of the competition will be announced in the April issue.

The Adjudicator is Mr. Ivor Brown, the well-known author and dramatic critic, whose decision is final. No entries can be accepted from members or associates of the Bacon Society.

The Editors of BACONIANA reserve the right to publish the prize winning essays.

MSS cannot be returned.

LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST

Competition Coupon